

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Introduction

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed March 8, 2005. Claims 1, 7, and 10 are amended, and new claim 11 is added. Claims 1-11 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)¹ as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,764,336 (*Ma*). Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,764,338 (*Fang*). Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ma*. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fang*.

By this paper, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 7. The Office Action admits that none of the prior art of record, particularly the applied art, discloses or teaches an isolating hole where the conductors are electrically separated from one another. See page 4 of the Office Action. As indicated in the Office Action, claim 7 was objected to as being

¹ Because *Ma* and *Fang* are only citable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Applicants do not admit that *Ma* and *Fang* are in fact prior art to the claimed invention but reserve the right to swear behind *Ma* and *Fang* if necessary to remove them as references.

dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By amending claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 7 as indicated in the Office Action, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 depend from claim 1 and overcome the art for at least this reason. For at least the same reasons, claim 10 is also in condition for allowance. New claim 11 includes similar limitations and is also in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have rewritten claim 1 to include all the limitations of claim 7 and any intervening claims. In particular, the scope of claim 1 has not been narrowed in any way so as to overcome any prior art, but has merely been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 7. As acknowledged by the Examiner, claim 1 is distinct from the prior art, and is now in a condition for allowance. For similar reasons, claims 2-10 and new claim 11 are also in condition for allowance.

The Applicant's submit the following comments concerning the Examiner's statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claimed invention of claims 1-11 is patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiners statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicants do not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action. Applicants further make no admission regarding the assertion and characterization of *Ma* and *Fang* in the Office Action as anticipating references.

Application No. 10/809,992
Amendment "A" dated September 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed March 8, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



CARL T. REED
Registration No. 45,454
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

CTR/tat/mrl
TAT0000001127V001